

**LEO FRANK
PLEADS
FOR A FAIR
TRIAL
IN SIGNED
CARD**

**“I Am Asking for That
Which**

the People of Atlanta Would Not Refuse to a Dirty Mongrel”

Leo M. Frank issued a signed statement Saturday night commenting on the interview of Chief Newport A. Lanford, of the city detective’s department, with Detective William J. Burns in which Lanford declared that neither the state nor the city had ever charged perversion to Frank.

“The charge of perversion having been withdrawn against me,” says Frank, “I do not see how any with a love of justice and fair play in his heart could deny me the privilege of a new trial, and a fair trial, which I have never had. I am seeking for that which the people of Atlanta would not refuse to a dirty mongrel cur, slinking through its streets, the right of a fair showing before its life is taken.”

“To the People of Atlanta:”

“I make this appeal to your fairness. It was the horrible charge that I was a pervert that poisoned your minds, infuriated you against me, and put me beyond the pale of human sympathy, where nothing that I said would be believed, where the word of a vile Negro and self-confessed perjurer was eagerly accepted in preference to mine, and where I could not obtain even the common privilege to which every man is entitled—a fair and impartial trial. It was this charge that so enraged the crowds around the court house that the judge upon the bench, fearing that I and my lawyers might be killed if the verdict was one of

acquittal, advised them to remain away, and keep me out of the court house. It is the charge

(Continued on Page 7, Column 1.)

PDF PAGE 7, COLUMN 5

LEO FRANK PLEADS FOR A FAIR TRIAL IN SIGNED CARD

(Continued from Page 1.)

that has poisoned and still poisons the minds of the public against me and denies me the commonest rights of a human being.

ONLY LANFORD RESPONDS.

“About two weeks ago, Mr. Burns made through the newspapers the request that if anyone had information as to any

acts of immorality on my part that they would communicate with him. He received not a single response, and on the next day, through the same newspapers, he made an offer of \$1,000 for such information. Again, there was no response except from Newport A. Lanford, the chief of detectives of the police department of Atlanta, who stated that he had in his possession the information that Burns was seeking and added sneeringly, 'probably more than he wants.'"

Mr. Burns being then out of the city, Mr. Lehon, his assistant, called and the chief of detectives told him that while he had the information, that he could not show it to him, but would show it to Mr. Burns when he returned. When Mr. Burns returned to Atlanta, he immediately called on Mr. Lanford and was told then by him that while he had the affidavits, he would not show them to him because the motion for the new trial was then pending. How that could be any reason for him to conceal this information, if he had it, I do not understand, but this is what he is quoted as saying in the Constitution: That he refused on the ground that he did not believe it would be doing justice to himself, to the state, or "even to Frank" for any publicity to be given as to the perversion affidavits until after the hearing, and then added, "at the trial of Frank we did not bring up the subject of perversion. It was brought out by Frank's lawyers." On last Friday again, after my side had closed its evidence, Mr. Lanford was again approached for these affidavits and he repeated the statement that neither the state nor the police department of Atlanta had ever claimed and did not now claim that I was a pervert, and that that charge had been put into the case by my own lawyers!

To this silly drivel, this pitiful failure of the man to realize his duties as an officer of the public, it is difficult for me to make reply. I can only say that his idiotic statement that the charge of perversion was brought into the case by my own lawyers is known to be a silly, impudent falsehood by thousands, if not millions of people who know perfectly well that it was brought into the case by the testimony of Conley when he was first put upon the stand

and examined by the solicitor general, representing the state of Georgia.

I submit to the people of Atlanta that Mr. Lanford has only taken this position because his bluff has been called. He knows perfectly well now and he has always known that the charge of perversion against me was a miserable, cowardly lie, and I further charge that if Mr. Burns had not demanded his proof, he never would have opened his mouth, but would have allowed the public and the courts to remain under the impression that he and the police still believed and charged me with being a pervert. I now make this solemn declaration, that I am not a pervert nor an immoral man in any sense of the word, and that these charges against me are a mass of horrible, atrocious lies. I further state and send my message straight to the heart and conscience of every man and woman in Georgia that I did not kill Mary Phagan; that I am absolutely innocent, and that my execution would not avenge her death.

The charge of perversion having been withdrawn against me, I do not see how any man with a love of justice and fair play in his heart could deny me the privilege of a new trial, and a fair trial, which I have never had. I am asking for that which the people of Atlanta would not refuse to a dirty mongrel cur slinking through its streets, the right to a fair showing before its life is taken. The charge of perversion, that is now withdrawn, made it impossible for me to get a fair trial. I have had none. I simply ask that I be given a fair show for my life; that I be allowed to make my defense before a jury that knows the truth that I am not a pervert, jury that will not be intimidated, by fear of being shot down and killed should it acquit me, a jury whose minds will be calm to weigh my testimony against that of a self-confessed Negro perjurer. A fair trial is what I want, is what I am entitled to and what no fair-minded man should deny me, and I appeal to the fair-minded people whose silent influence stands back of the courts and whose servants the courts are, to see that I am given a fair trial.

PDF PAGE 7, COLUMN 1

**PLAN VIGOROUS
ATTACK
ON DEFENSE OF
FRANK**

Solicitor and
Detectives Have
Many Affidavits for
Use to
Prevent New Trial

Solicitor General Hugh M. Dorsey spent Saturday directing the activities of a corps of city detectives, who secured many affidavits, which will be used to attack the new evidence

introduced last Friday by the defense of Leo M. Frank at the hearing of his extraordinary motion for a new trial.

The solicitor refuses to discuss the case in any of its phases. The city detectives, however, characterize as another "Mincey affair" the claim of Rev. C. B. Ragsdale, the Baptist pastor, that he heard a Negro, identified as Conley, confess to the murder. Mincey, an insurance agent, it will be remembered claimed that Conley confessed to him, but he was not used in the court as a witness.

The detectives before the trial, had many affidavits, attacking Mincey. Now despite the fact that only forty-eight hours had elapsed since the name of the minister was brought into the case the detectives have placed in the hands of the solicitor evidence combatting the testimony. Several affidavits in reference to Mr. Ragsdale were made Saturday by citizens of Cherokee county, where the minister formerly lived, and the solicitor has been notified that they are in the mails, it is said.

As to the method of the state's attack upon Annie Maud Carter, the negress who claims Conley confessed to her, when she promised to marry him, little is known, except that the affidavit given the detectives Thursday morning, before she made her statement to the defense, will be used. In this the woman is quoted as claiming that she endeavored to persuade Conley to confess and failed.

The state also has in its hands the original affidavit of Mrs. May Barrett. Soon after the crime Mrs. Barrett and her daughter, now Mrs. Maud Bailey, went to the solicitor's offices. One of the women urged the other to make a certain kind of affidavit, it is known, and the latter refused. Mrs. Barrett, when she left the solicitor's office was weeping bitterly and she and her daughter were apparently angry with each other.

AFFIDAVIT FROM WOMAN.

Both of the women and the solicitor refused to discuss the interview. The solicitor, however, has one affidavit from Mrs. Barrett, but whether or not it will be used, when the hearing next Friday is resumed or not is a matter for conjecture.

Mary Phagan was killed on April 26, 1913, a year ago today. The case against Frank, who was arrested a few days after the crime, bids fair to stay in the courts for another year, before it is definitely and finally decided.

PDF PAGE 7, COLUMN 2

Detective Burns Says Notes Written by Jim Conley Prove Him Pervert and Murderer

This is a reproduction from one of the notes Anna Maud Carter says Conley wrote to her in jail.
--

This is a reproduction from one of the notes found by Mary Phagan's body, both of which Conley admits he wrote.
--

Detective Has Scores of Notes Written to Negress in Tower Which He Invites Public to Inspect

Exhibiting scores of notes which he says were written by James Conley, Negro sweeper at the pencil factory and accuser of Leo M. Frank as the murderer of Mary Phagan, Detective W. J. Burns issued a statement to the press last night in which he claims he has fastened upon Conley not only the sole responsibility for the two notes found beside Mary Phagan's body but also the sole responsibility for her murder.

The notes appear, by comparison with those found by the body and which Conley admits he wrote, to have been written by Conley. Reproductions from one of them and from one of the others found by the body are presented herewith. Mr. Burns in his statement asserts positively there can be no doubt Conley wrote the notes he possesses; and he invites any one interested to inspect them in his office and compare them with the murder notes.

Phrases too vile for reproduction appear in the notes Mr. Burns has. The detective points to these as indicating the perversion of the writer's mind. He points to their number as indicating a prolific note-writer. He points to uses of the words "did" instead of "done," and "Negro" instead of "nigger," as refuting the solicitor's argument at the trial that no Negro would have used those words unless they were dictated by a white man.

The following statement by Detective Burns elaborates upon the affidavit by Anna Maud Carter, a Negro woman who was imprisoned for a time with Conley in the Tower, and explains the defense on this new phase of the matter. The Carter woman's affidavit was made a sensational amendment of the defense's extraordinary motion for a new trial Friday. In it she swore not only that Conley wrote a number of notes to her, but that he confessed to her he killed Mary Phagan and wrote the notes himself, first putting them in the bosom of her dress and then on the ground beside her.

BURNS' STATEMENT.

Following is the detective's own statement in full:

"I have just come into possession of evidence of the most startling and convincing nature against the Negro., Jim Conley, an examination of which exclusively proves that the murder note found by the body of Mary Phagan emanated exclusively from his perverted brain. It is evidence of a nature more powerful and convincing than an actual confession from the Negro himself. This evidence consists of a large number of letters written by the Negro, Jim while in jail, addressed to the Negro woman, Anna Maud Carter, who recently made an affidavit charging that Conley had confessed to committing the murder. These letters are some of the letters referred to by the Carter woman in her affidavit, as having been written to her. These letters show beyond a peradventure of a doubt that Conley is an abnormal man, just the vile degenerate that I have heretofore pictured him. The letters are full of the vilest, most abominable language dealing with Conley's lust for this woman. His perverted passion was aroused

by this woman and most of the letters are full of this vile stuff. It fills one with a loathing and disgust to merely read them. They are the most nauseating things imaginable. As you see here, most of the letters are addressed to 'Anna Maud Carter,' but Conley apparently having possessed her already in his mind, addressed some of them to 'Anna Maud Conley.' Conley asserts today in his statement—in the newspapers—that he barely knows the woman, but these letters utterly refute this and show that the utmost intimacy existed between them, and that Conley has simply entangled himself in another lie. The letters contain so much vile unprintable stuff that it would be difficult to print hardly any one of the letters in full, but I hope that you newspaper men will be able to reprint some portion of the letters, as there could be no more convincing proof of Conley's guilt. They establish beyond question what a vile and loathsome brute he is. It was maintained at the trial of Leo M. Frank, by the state, that Conley could write only with the greatest difficulty, yet I have in my hand a mass of these letters. The great number of these letters substantiate my previous declaration that Conley was a prolific note writer.

SIGNIFICANCE OF WORDS.

"It is also interesting to note that these letters contain the words "did" and "Negro." These words are most significant in view of the fact that at trial it was maintained by the state that Leo Frank must have conceived and dictated the 'death notes,' because they contained the words 'did' and 'Negro,' and that if Conley had conceived these notes, he would have written them 'done' and 'nigger.'"

"These letters completely explode the argument of the state, because they contain, as before stated, the words 'did' and 'Negro' in the plainest writing. The defense" contended on the trial that no white man, especially one of Frank's type and character, could have possibly conceived—and dictated—the 'murder notes' found by the body, and the only answer that the state attempted to make to this charge, was that Frank must have dictated them because they contained the words, 'did' and

'Negro.' The letters of Conley addressed to Anna Maud Carter completely refute this contention of the state, and leave Conley as the sole author and writer of the 'death notes' found by the body of Mary Phagan. It has always been admitted both by the state and the defense that the author and writer of the 'death notes' was the murderer of the little girl. Now that these letters have established unquestionably that Conley is the author of the notes, there should be no longer any question of Conley's guilt. The authenticity of these letters is beyond question. A mere glance at them shows the identity of Conley's handwriting. It is identical with the 'death notes.'" The 'h's', the 's's', the 'o's', and the 'w's,' are typical, in fact, every letter is a typical Conley letter. These letters are open for the inspection of any one who wishes to see them, whosoever he may be. In this respect the defense different somewhat from Chief Lanford, who trumpets forth the charge of 'perversion,' and when his bluff is called, backs down and says he has nothing to show; in fact, that he has never made the charge."
